09/22/2005

```
1
  1
             UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT.
                                           CERTIFIED ORIGINAL
  2
               DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS
                                            LEGALINK BOSTON
  3
       TRANS-SPEC TRUCK SERVICE, INC.,)
  4
       TRUCK SERVICE,
  5
                Plaintiff,
  6
            vs.
                                       )CIVIL ACTION
                                       )04-11836-RCL
  7
      CATERPILLAR, INC.,
 8
                Defendant.
 .9
            THE DEPOSITION of CLARISSA COLMER, called
10
      for examination by the plaintiff in the above
11
      entitled causeIpursuant to the provisions of
12
      the United States District Court and taken
13
      before me, Grace Cafaro, CSR-RPR-CP, License
14
15
      #084-000702, a Notary Public in and for the
      County of Peoria and State of Illinois, at the
16
17
     Radisson Hotel, 117 North Western Avenue, in
18
     the City of Peoria, County of Peoria and State
     of Illinois, on the 22nd day of September, A.D.
19
     2005, commencing at 2:00 p.m.
20
21
22
23
```

they made the decision? Did they speak with

23

EXAMINATION BY MR. GRUNERT:

Q. Ms. Colmer, Mr. Samito asked you the reason why the people who made the decision that Trans-Spec flywheel and flywheel housing failures should no longer be paid under warranty, what they took into account in making that decision, and you testified I think to the effect that they took into account not only information they had gotten from the dealer about application, but also the general performance of C-12 engines or words to that effect.

Can you explain what you mean by that part of the answer?

A. I understood that when they looked at the failure history on Trans-Spec's units they looked at the history of flywheels in general on all C-12s and that there was not a significant failure rate in relationship to the failure rate that Trans-Spec was seeing that was occurring on Trans-Spec units, that the failure on Trans-Spec's units was significantly

1	A.	I understand it was due to the repetitive	77
2		nature of the failures and the additional	
3		information that they had acquired on these	
4	į	units that allowed that led them to make	
5		that decision.	
6		MR. SAMITO: I have nothing more.	
7		MR. GRUNERT: Thank you, that's all I	
8		have.	
9			
10		FURTHER DEPONENT SAYETH NOT	
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			į